LOUISVILLE DEMOCRAT---Extra.

TO THE PATRIOTIC OF KENTUCKY OF ALL PARTIES.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—

Our country's honor is dear to all who value our free institutions. The renown we have gained in arms will be a poor consolation to the patriot, if he must admit that we have lost our character for justice and magnanimity; and now that the most violent and unscrupulous assaults are made upon the honor of our country, and nothing that a malicious ingenuity can invent to blacken her character and render her name a reproach amongst the virtuous and good, and enlist universal sympathy for an insolent and malignant enemy, is left undone, we feel it a duty we owe to the people of Kentucky to present the truth respecting the conduct of Mexico, which will satisfy all who read it, that on our part it was war or dishonor—war, or the forfeiture of all respect as a nation—war, or the forfeiture of all confidence in the boasted protection of the stars and stripes—war, or submission to an endless progression of insults and injuries, increasing in number and aggravation. The conduct of Mexico upon the annexation of Texas was but a consummation of a long series of outrages, not only unprovoked by any unfriendly act of the United States, but in despite of kindness and generous forbearance.—When Mexico was struggling for independence against old Spain, the United States were first to extend the friendly hand to lift her up to a station amongst independent nations. They were first to send her an accredited minister, and give her every kind assurance of friendship. How were our acts of friendship rewarded? Let a long unquestioned list of burning wrongs testify. Mexicans seemed to consider the United States a fair victim of perfidy and insult. They commenced their depredations in 1817. Our government complained of their acts, in behalf of our citizens. The government of Mexico made empty professions. Our remonstrances were answered only by a repetition of injuries still more gross and insulting, until in 1837 the catalogue had attained an incredible length. Mr. Forsyth made out a list of these cases, with the evidence, and laid them before Congress. From his official report of that year we take a few specimens, which are stated as briefly as possible. Let those who value the honor of the country read, and ask themselves what must be thought of him who denounces the present war, on our part, as a war against God. The cases are numbered as they appeared in the report of Mr. Forsyth, which was published with the President's message. We present a few of them only:

"No. 9.—BRIG CATO.—This vessel was boarded at Alvarado on the 26th of August, 1824, by some twenty men, who rifled her of $2,701 in specie, and of numerous other articles. After threatening the life of the captain and wounding two of the crew, they set the vessel adrift by cutting her chain cable, which, with the anchor, were lost. The claim in this case is for $5,544."

"No. 13.—BRIG DELIGHT, of Philadelphia.—A DOUBLE CLAIM.—This vessel in March, 1835, touched at San Blas, where the officers of the custom house compelled [illegible] cargo over a mile to the custom house stores, and its re-shipment. The damage to the owners was estimated at $3,716 48. The same vessel entered the port of Sisal in September of the same year, where she was seized by the collector with an armed force, part of her cargo forced on shore, her hatches broken open, and the cargo taken to the custom house. Estimate of damages arising from the condemnation and sale of the cargo, &c., $15,692 50. The Mexican secretary of the treasury has assured Mr. Poinsett that an order had been given to release the vessel and cargo. Mr. Poinsett pronounced this one of the most flagrant and unjustifiable violations of the property of American citizens on record."

"No. 14.—SCHOONER FAIR AMERICA, of Baltimore.—This vessel arrived at Refugio January 4th, 1826, was admitted to entry, landed her cargo under permit, and in part removed it to town, when the whole was seized by the Mexican authorities, and confiscated and sold. The Mexican consul at Baltimore afterwards requested of his government that the property might be restored and the owner indemnified. Mr. Wilson's claim for damages in $60,225 21, the justice of which was understood to be acknowledged by the Mexican government. To the demand of the American minister for damages in this case, the Mexican government made evasive replies, and made no answer to his last note on the subject."

"No. 27.—John Baldwin, an American citizen, complains of gross and outrageous treatment at the hands of the Alcalde of Minotitlan, in Guazcualco. He asserts that the alcalde was interested in a suit which was brought against him by one of his creatures. Some altercation occurring at the proceedings before the alcalde, he was ordered to the stocks. He refused to submit, and in attempting to escape was shot at, and severely injured by a fall. He was captured, made to stand in the stocks, and afterwards imprisoned. The Mexican government were informed subsequently that the United States government 'would regard this a national question.' The reply of the Mexican executive was, that it was a matter of judicial investigation, &c."

"No. 28.—SCHOONER TOPAZ.—The master of this vessel contracted, in 1832, to transport 150 Mexican soldiers from Matamoras to Galveston. During the passage the master and mate were killed by the Mexican officers, and the crew were forced to run the vessel into Anahuac. Here THEY were imprisoned on a charge of killing their captain and mate, and attempts were made by the officers above mentioned to make them confess to that crime. They were at last liberated on their agreement to be bound to the officers to serve them for three years. One of them subsequently escaped to the United States, and testified to the facts above stated. He stated that the Mexican officers divided the captain's money between them. He thinks he had 3,000 or 4,000 dollars."

"No. 40.—The schooner Harriet Elizabeth was stranded near Matagorda, in 1835. While in this situation she was fired upon by a Mexican schooner, and her captain, crew, and passengers carried to Matamoros and imprisoned. Reparation was demanded by Mr. Ellis, in 1836, but has never been given by the Mexican government."

"No. 42.—The brig Jane and four other vessels were detained at Matamoros, in 1836, contrary to express treaty stipulations, and when reparation was demanded, the excuse rendered for the outrage was, that certain hostile vessels were cruising in those waters; and that the orders by which the Jane, &c., was detained were without authority from the supreme government. No reparation was, however, granted."

"No. 43.—In 1836 the brig Eclipse was seized at Tabasco, (on what ground it does not appear,) her crew insulted and maltreated, and her captain imprisoned. Amount claimed for the seizure of this vessel, $9,157."

"No. 44.—Mr. Coleman, acting consul of the United States at Tabasco, was summoned before the authorities in 1836, and publicly insulted and ill treated, because he refused to legalize certain documents, the result of which would be to defraud."

"No. 45.—The schooner Aurora was stranded on the coast of Mexico in 1836. A part of the cargo was landed by the crew, when it was immediately taken possession of by an armed body of Mexicans. On the crew remonstrating against these proceedings, they were insulted, maltreated, and the mate seriously injured. Thereupon, the crew proceeded to Tabasco, and delivered the goods over to our consul at that place, who on taking possession thereof, found that over one-half had been plundered."

"No. 47.—It was proposed to sell the brig *Fourth of July* to the Mexican government; but while the negotiation was going on, she was taken possession of by the Mexican authorities and the Mexican flag hoisted. Mr. Ellis, then our Minister to Mexico, demanded the release of the vessel, to which no answer had been returned."

"No. 49.—In 1836, William Hallett, and Zilmon Hall, citizens of the United States, were arrested in the streets of Matamoros by an armed force, who struck one of them in the face, and took both to the principal barrack. Here they were confined, while a guard was placed at the door of the house of the American consul to prevent his interference in the matter. The house was searched for the consul himself, and much of his property stolen."

"No. 51.—The American citizens at Tampico having requested that a man-of-war might be sent for their protection, Lieut. Osborne, with a boat's crew from the revenue cutter Jefferson, proceeded there, when he was arrested by the authorities, carried off and examined. On his return, he learned that his crew had also been arrested, and held for a long time in confinement. Gomez, who committed these outrages, was removed therefor by the supreme government, but was subsequently appointed commandant at Vera Cruz."

"No. 53.—The schooner Wm. A. Turner, of which Jas. O'Flaherty was master, was seized off Sisal, in 1834, by an armed Mexican force. The vessel was released after Capt. O'F. had given bonus for her value. In 1836, his vessel was again seized, himself confined, liberated, and after entering into bonds for $1,200, his vessel released. Soon after, the vessel was again seized, and the captain confined in the cabin, from whence he was sent as a prisoner to Tabasco. From this place, where he had been confined in the public prison, he was conveyed still as a prisoner, to Campeachy, and cast a second time into confinement.

"Capt. O'F. is entirely ignorant of the cause of these repeated indignities, and at no time has any charge been preferred against him.

"He claims for the loss of property $18,000."

General Jackson, in his message of '37, uses the following emphatic language in reference to the cases reported by Mr. Forsyth:

"That the length of time since some of the injuries have been committed, the repeated and unavailing applications for redress, the wanton character of some of the outrages upon the property and persons of our citizens, upon the officers and flag of the United States, independent of recent insults to this government and people by the extraordinary Mexican minister, WOULD JUSTIFY IN THE EYES OF ALL NATIONS, IMMEDIATE WAR."

It must be allowed that our government had permitted this list of atrocities to be swelled to an enormous size. But these are not all, up to that period, (Dec. 2d, 1837.) Twelve more afterwards came to light, and are to be found on file in the department. Out of these we select two:

"No. 67.—MARY HUGHES, WIDOW OF GEORGE HUGHES, MASTER OF THE BRIG 'JOHN,' of N. Y.—The brig 'John,' lying at anchor in the river Tabasco in 1832, was boarded and captured by an armed force, on a pretext altogether unfounded. Capt. Hughes was knocked down, cruelly beaten with the buts of the muskets of the boarding party, carried off and imprisoned, and the cargo and stores of the vessel plundered. Captain Hughes subsequently died from the wounds received on this occasion.

"Mary Hughes claims reparation therefor."

"No. 68.—JAMES COCHRANE, engineer of the steamer Hidalgo, was impressed into the Mexican service together with the boat in 1832—cruelly and ignominiously treated, and compelled to do duty as engineer for two months. He claims reparation for the breaking up of his business, and for false imprisonment."

Our forbearance had invited the repetition of insults. And now let us see if our generosity in 1837, in not acting with decision, was at all appreciated by Mexico. As appears above, General Jackson had declared, in his message in 1837, that the conduct of Mexico would "*justify war in the eyes of all nations.*" "That remedy, however," he added, "should not be used by just and generous nations, confiding in their strength, for injuries committed, if it can be honorably avoided; and it has occurred to me that, considering the embarrassed condition of that country, we should act with both wisdom and moderation by giving to Mexico one more opportunity to atone for the past, before we take redress into our own hands. To avoid all misconception on the part of Mexico, as well as to protect our national character from reproach, this opportunity should be given, with the avowed design and full preparation to take immediate satisfaction if it should not be obtained, on a repetition of a demand for it. To this end I recommend that an act be passed, authorizing reprisals, and the use of the naval force of the United States, by the Executive, against Mexico, to enforce them, in the event of a refusal by the Mexican government to come to an immediate adjustment of the matters in controversy between us, upon another demand thereof, made from on board one of our vessels of war on the coast of Mexico."

The subject was taken up by both houses of Congress. The committee of the Senate fully sustained the President as to the character of these wrongs. It was agreed on all hands that they had reached an extent of aggravation which could no longer be endured. As often as these injuries had been received, the demand for redress had been made upon the Mexican government, but these demands had always been evaded, whilst the injuries constantly multiplied. The majority of the committee were the friends of General Jackson; but there was little difference of opinion on this subject, so flagrant had the conduct of Mexico been. The committee concluded their report with the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate concur in opinion with the President of the United States, that another demand ought to be made for redress of our grievances, the mode and manner of which under the 34th article of the treaty, so far as it may be applicable and properly confided to his discretion. They cannot doubt, from the justice of our claims, that this demand will result in speedy redress; but should they be disappointed in this reasonable expectation, a state of things will then have occurred, which will make it the imperative duty of Congress promptly to consider what further measures may be required by the honor of the nation, and the rights of our injured fellow-citizens."

Previous to the time of presenting this report, the Mexican minister Gorostiza, had taken offence at an order of President Jackson to our army on the Sabine, and had demanded his passports; but before he took his departure from the United States, he published a scandalous libel against this country, and Mexico had approved his infamous conduct. The committee commented severely on this conduct of the Mexican minister. Mr. CLAY considered his conduct a great "diplomatic irregularity," "wrong and highly reprehensible." Still, as the pamphlet had made no impression and done no mischief, he did not think the Secretary of State should have brought it to the notice of the Mexican government; whilst, however, Mr. C. disagreed with the committee in some parts of the report, "he concurred entirely with them in regard to the resolution, and hoped it would obtain the unanimous consent of the Senate." We have noticed the remarks of Mr. C. to show that this was no party movement. We need only add that the resolution passed the Senate by a unanimous vote. The report of the committee in the House of Representatives was made at the same session of Congress. We present a portion of it to show how the matter was viewed at that time:

"On the 3d of May, 1836, the United States schooner Jefferson anchored off the port of Tampico, direct from Pensacola, having been sent out by order of Commodore Dallas. Lieut. Osborn and his boat's crew, who went on shore, were seized and imprisoned, and the vessel prohibited from entering the river. A demand for satisfaction made by the American consul was haughtily refused. The Jefferson left the port, but communicated with the sloop of war Grampus, of eighteen guns, which came to off the bar; and on the following day there arrived another American corvette, and both anchored there.

"The commander of the Grampus directed a note to the principal of the port, informing him that by order of the chief of the division on the West India station, he had come to enter into a correspondence with him relative to the insult which he had inflicted on the American flag. A note followed from the foreign department of the Mexican government to Mr. Ellis, requesting him to interpose his authority, and order the vessels to retire. Mr. Ellis very properly declined to do so. In a few days an official communication apprised Mr. Ellis that the Mexican government had supplanted the officer in command at Tampico, 'by substituting in his stead a chief who, it flatters itself, will know how to preserve greater harmony with the agents and subjects of foreign nations;' and announced that 'a summary investigation had been ordered to be instituted, which by putting in its true light the conduct of Mr. Gomez, would apply to him the punishment he deserved, if he should prove culpable, as well as to all others who may have taken any part in the affair treated upon,' renewing the request that Mr. Ellis would then give his orders for the withdrawal of the squadron from before Tampico, which was done, and the vessels departed. The committee would be pleased if they could stop here in the narrative, but they are compelled to remark that, shortly afterwards, the individual whose punishment was thus promised, as an atonement for the insult to the American flag, was recalled into service, and assigned to a command upon the coast, where his hostile feelings might again endanger the security of American citizens or property.

"The effect of this open withdrawal of the apology yielded to the American government was, as might have been anticipated, soon made to appear in fresh outrages upon some American citizens, who were entitled to have been treated with peculiar forbearance, not only because they were in the employment of the American government, but because they constituted a part of the crew of one of the national vessels, whose services on board might have been very essential. The arrest and imprisonment of eight of the seamen belonging to the sloop of war Natchez will not now be made the subject of comment, further than to remark, that the prevention of the American consul from visiting them, whilst sick and in prison, from the 4th to the 19th of November, was an act of unpardonable inhumanity, and appears to have proceeded from the same officer whose fictitious punishment, but real promotion, had been offered as an atonement for a previous insult to the American flag.

"Looking through the catalogue of complaints which the United States have to make against Mexico, on their own account, as the party whose dignity and honor are assailed, the committee are unable to perceive any proof of a desire on the part of the Mexican government to repair injury or satisfy honor.

"The merchant vessels of the United States have been fired into, her citizens attacked and even put to death, and her ships of war treated with disrespect [illegible] they had a right to expect hospitality."

The minority of the committee, Mr. Caleb Cushing, a leader of the opposition in the lower house at that time, also presented a report, not differing materially with the majority, but suggesting some palliation for the outrageous conduct of Mexico in the disorders consequent upon her protracted struggle for independence, and the irritation produced by the revolution in Texas, indulging a hope that measures then in progress might lead to amicable redress of long standing and insufferable wrongs. But, says the minority, "If the reverse shall hereafter appear, and it shall prove (contrary to expectations) that the Mexican government, not satisfied with having persisted in so many acts injurious to the United States, has added thereto the aggravation of procrastinating redress by insincere and perfidious pretences of accommodation, he shall consider it the right of the federal government to *pursue in that event the most prompt and decided measures for amply vindicating the interests and honor of the United States.*"

One would suppose that measures were now in progress which must lead to a speedy settlement or an open rupture. Congress, however, declined to confer on the President the power to make reprisals, in the event of failure to obtain redress. He was only authorized to make a final demand; presenting at the same time the well authenticated cases of outrages upon our flag and our citizens. Mexico foresaw in this generous forbearance an open sea for evasion and perfidy. Her treatment of this last formal demand was highly characteristic.

It will be seen that deceitful assurances of friendship were made to our government, and decided hostility manifested at home, where all measures of redress had to originate.

Mr. Forsyth, our Secretary of State, examined the list of grievances which had been presented to Congress, and rejecting those which might be disputed or evaded, made out a new list of 57 cases, with the evidence of their validity, and sent them by a special messenger to the government of Mexico, with that *last* formal (formidable?) demand. The Mexican minister replied in true Mexican style, chuckling no doubt at this terrible demand without the means to enforce it.

"The President, says he, notwithstanding it is his anxious wish not to delay the moment of *that* final and *equitable* adjustment which is to terminate the existing difficulties between the two governments, has, however, ordered that the voluminous series of documents accompanying the said note from the honorable John Forsyth, by which the claims in question are supported, should be translated and examined in this department. His Excellency has also directed that as this goes on, the results should be compared with those derived from evidence already existing in this department, with regard to all matters connected with them; and that where differences should be observed, the local authorities should be called on for new and more distinct information. Finally, it is the desire of his Excellency that nothing should be left undone which may contribute to the most speedy and equitable determination of the subjects which have so seriously engaged the attention of the American government. The minister of Mexico will then have the honor to communicate successively to Mr. Forsyth, the opinion of the President on each case, and the resolution adopted by him in consequence." It will be recollected that these cases had all been presented as they occurred, and repeatedly pressed upon the Mexican government. They were of long years standing; and now this is the answer to THAT final demand.

Let us now see what progress was made in this searching investigation, now, for the first time, entered upon, with *Mexican* assurances. This communication of the Mexican Minister of War was made to our Department of State July 29th, 1837. August, September and October came and passed away. The time for the meeting of our own Congress drew near, and Mexico saw that her own schemes of evasion required that something should be done. In November her minister informed our Secretary of State that of the 57 cases presented to his government, it had looked into as many as FOUR. It had also, with most superfluous industry, examined five others which were falsely alleged to have been presented. The cabinet of Mexico, with the mean roguery of a fifteen-shilling attorney, had shunned the authenticated list presented by our Secretary, and taken the list laid before our own Congress, out of which Mr. Forsyth had selected undisputed cases of outrage. Of course very plausible replies could be made against claims that nobody urged. Four of the cases replied to, however, were in the list presented with that last demand. The first concerned the case of the "Ship Louisa." The cargo of the Louisa, consisting of arms, cordage, and flour, with other provisions, was taken at the port of Accapulco, by order of D. Iturbide, and appropriated to the use of the Mexican government. On the 1st of February, 1822, that government acknowledged the debt, and decreed the payment of the sum of $48,363. A part of this sum, $14,418, was subsequently paid, but the remainder is still due. Thus stands the case, and here is the reply of the Mexican Secretary:

"From the records of this department it appears, that after various proceedings, and the payment of a part of the debt to the claimants, the subject had been referred to the general Congress for its determination as to the remainder. His Excellency, the President, being desirous that these affairs should be brought to a speedy termination, has been pleased to direct that endeavors should be made to have these matters decided at the next ordinary session of that august body, for which purpose the department will use every exertion."

We have not room to notice the replies to the other three cases. They are [illegible] and evasive; conveyed to our government along with hollow and deceitful professions of amity; insulting, because obviously insincere. Whilst expressing the strongest wishes for an amicable settlement, and good understanding with the United States, the demagogues of Mexico held quite a different style at home. They were striving to inculcate the idea upon the barbarous and ignorant Mexicans, that they were the aggrieved party. On the 20th May, 1837, the Mexican Congress passed a decree, from which we extract the following:

"The government (Mexico) is authorized, in case the United States should deny satisfaction which we should ask on our part, or delay it beyond the time which shall be fixed, conformably with the treaty, or should continue the open aggressions already committed, to close the ports to the trade of that nation; to prohibit the introduction and use of its manufactures; to establish a period for the consumption or exportation already on hand; and to take all measures required for the purpose, and for the safety of the Republic."

The Minister at War had promised that his department should use every exertion to have the case of the Louisa decided at the next ordinary session of the Mexican Congress. He redeemed his promise by reporting to that body as follows:

"This republic, to show that she has been aggrieved, would require nothing else than the general conviction existing in Europe and America that the United States have not conducted themselves as good neighbors. If all the journals and reviews that have been published within the last two years be examined, it will be seen that, notwithstanding the difference of opinion professed by their editors, all agree in qualifying as hostile the conduct maintained by the American cabinet towards Mexico. The official journals themselves of the United States, prove this truth; and it is equally proved by the debates in their Congress, as well as in the British Parliament."

And again:

"Those circumstances, then, of which the Department of War and Marine has already informed Congress, obliged the government to ask for a suitable explanation; and Mr. F. Pizarro Martinez was, to this effect, appointed minister plenipotentiary in Washington, after having been furnished with all the instruction necessary for the fulfilment of his mission. It is very painful to be obliged to state to Congress that, up to the present moment, this department has not received a single proof of the disposition of the United States to adjust our differences."

"We shall soon have officially the result of the mission of Mr. F. P. Martinez, and he will either re-establish our relations, or authorize the government to put into effect the law of May 20th of last year, and to take that attitude which justice and the fair character of the nation demand. Till now, it has thought proper to exert every effort in favor of peace between two nations, whose union and prosperity excite the liveliest interest in both hemispheres."

So far, it was obvious that no redress was intended by the Mexican government. All examination of the list of grievances was suspended; and that last formal demand was likely to end as an empty bravado. But the matter was again brought before our Congress, and it became evident to Mexico that some new expedient for delay must be resorted to. Accordingly in April, 1838, the Mexican minister proposed that the matters in dispute should be referred to an umpire to be agreed upon between the United States and Mexico. It is remarkable that Mexico had been an entire year examining claims, according to her professions, and had found it so difficult that she had got through only four brought to her notice; and now she is ready to refer them to an umpire. Doubtless very much to the dissatisfaction of Mexico, the proposition of reference was accepted. The Mexican minister at New Orleans, instead of Washington, was promptly informed that his proposal was acceded to. He then wrote home for power to enter into a convention, which it seems he was not yet intrusted with, and which he did not obtain until September, '38. The convention was signed at Washington, but not ratified by Mexico, as that government alleged that the consent of the King of Prussia to provide an arbitrator could not be obtained, until April, 1839—two years after that last demand. And in the mean time the catalogue of national insults, violence and wrongs, increased to a shameful extent. The subjects of England had been mistreated by Mexico. That government sent a demand for redress and vessels of war with the simple alternative—immediate reparation or bombardment. Her demand was complied with. France, in a similar cause of complaint, being refused redress, battered down the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa, and obtained what she demanded. The United States forbore and expostulated, and were rewarded with insults and indignities. After that last formal demand, which was to be successful, or, as all parties agreed, we were to take prompt measures for redress; and whilst we were exercising a generous magnanimity in the midst of the perfidious delays of Mexico, she was perpetrating her outrages with additional violence and aggravations. No less than twenty-eight aggravated cases of lawless outrage and violence occurred between the time of our "last demand" and the conclusion of the convention above referred to. At the hazard of prolonging this communication we cannot omit a few specimens of these cases. The first, No. 70, is that of Samuel Baldwin, who is the son of an officer of the revolution, and resided near Pittsburg. He went to Mexico under the solemn guaranty of treaties, and settled near Alvarado upon a coffee plantation, having carried with him the hard earnings of a frugal life. The sequel is below. Notwithstanding he could say "I am a Roman citizen," he has returned a cripple, reduced to penury. This case was so flagrant that even the Mexican commissioners could make no objection to the entire claim of $230,000. Not a dollar has been paid:

"No. 70.—CLAIM OF SAMUEL BALDWIN.—Mr. B., a citizen of the United States, settled in Mexico some years since, and had acquired considerable property. On the most frivolous pretext, he was seized and thrown into the public prison with the vilest criminals. While there, additional charges were fabricated against him; he was loaded with irons, poison was given him in his coffee, and he endured the most unparalleled sufferings from the brutal treatment of one Gomez, his jailor. From Acaynacan where these barbarities were committed, Mr. B. was sent to Vera Cruz, and cast into a wet and filthy jail in the castle of San Juan de Ulloa. On his journey, which was performed [illegible] heavy burden of his chains, [illegible] an incurable lameness. For these unparalleled outrages no redress has been received from the Mexican government."

"No. 71.—CLAIMS OF HENRY B. HORTON, WALTER W. ADAMS, AND JAMES KELLEY.—The claimants, seamen on board the American barque, "Roger Williams," having been paid off and discharged at Monterey, California, in 1840, were waiting for an opportunity to return home, when they, together with other Americans, were seized and conducted to prison. They obtained their release, but were a second time arrested, robbed, and cast into jail, no cause for their commitment ever having been assigned.

"No. 71—CLAIM OF WM. LORD ETHERIDGE THOMPSON.—Thompson, an American seaman, was wrecked near San Blas in 1835. In 1840, he was twice arrested and thrown into prison—no cause whatever being assigned for his detention in either case. After suffering the most cruel treatment, he was released; but found, on his return to the farm where he had labored since his shipwreck in 1835, that all his property had been taken from him.

"No redress has ever been granted by the Mexican government.

"No. 74.—CLAIMS OF ISAAC GRAHAM, WILLIAM CHURCH, JOSEPH L. MAJORS, CHARLES BROWN, AND OTHERS.—These Americans, with six others, were seized in California, where they were engaged in business, in April, 1840, by the Mexican authorities, without any just cause or provocation, and thrown into prison. From their memorial to the Department of State, it appears that they received the most barbarous treatment. After being conveyed from one place to another in the lower hold of vessels and in chains—six being confined to one bar of iron—they were finally set at liberty in the city of Tepec, without any reason being assigned by the Mexican government for its outrageous proceeding against them. It also appears that at the time of his arrest, the house of Mr Graham was surrounded, fired into, and $36,000 in specie plundered therefrom.

"No. 75.—CLAIMS OF A. C. BREDALL OF NEW ORLEANS.—1st. The schooner Lodi, with a valuable cargo of lawful goods, belonging to Mr. Bredall, sailed from New Orleans in May, 1838, bound for Matamoros in Mexico. On her arrival there, without any allegation of offence committed or contemplated, she was seized, her cargo landed, exposed, and pillaged. After a long detention, the cargo and vessel were restored; but the latter was so much injured by worms, and her sails, rigging, and stores so much damaged that she was obliged to run on shore on her passage back to New Orleans, in order to save the lives of the passengers and crew. A total loss of the vessel and cargo was the consequence.

"2d. In 1843, Mr. Bredall arrived at Vera Cruz, with passports granted him by the Mexican consul at New Orleans. He presented them to the proper authorities, but was arrested and imprisoned on the charge of a design upon the life of Gen. Santa Anna. During his detention, he suffered the most wanton, cruel, and humiliating indignities and privations; and upon his release, he reached New Orleans in a helpless and shattered condition, his constitution broken, his hearing destroyed, and sinking under a hopeless consumption. It is proper to remark that the British Minister demanded and obtained liberal damages on behalf of three British subjects who were imprisoned with Mr. Bredall.

"No. 81.—CLAIM OF CAPTAIN JONAS P. LEVY.—1st. In 1843, the store of the claimant with all its contents was forcibly taken possession of with the connivance of the public authorities, and never returned. Amount of property lost, $6,846 02. Reparation has been refused from the commission of the outrage to the present time.

"2d. This claim is for illegal duties extorted from Capt. Levy by the collector of the port of Laguna, in 1843, under false pretences, amounting to $513 89.

"3d. The third claim is for goods belonging to the claimant and his brother, thrown overboard by the captain of the steamboat Petrita, amounting to $7,483 25, for which relief has been denied by the Mexican government."

But you will inquire into the result of this convention, and we give a brief history of it from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made to Congress June 24th, 1846:

"The board of commissioners, under this convention, consisting of two American and two Mexican citizens, was not organized until the 25th of August, 1840; and under its provisions they were compelled to terminate their labors within eighteen months from that date. Four of these eighteen months were spent in preliminary discussions, which had arisen on frivolous and dilatory objections, raised by the Mexican commissioners. Indeed, from their course of conduct, it was at one time seriously apprehended that the board might separate without hearing or deciding a single case. Finally, however, on the 24th December, 1840, they commenced the examination of the claims of our citizens, having then but fourteen months left to conclude their labors. During this period, the board allowed eleven claims—amounting, principal and interest, to the sum of $439,393 82; and the umpire, upon disagreeing reports of the American and Mexican commissioners, allowed fifty-one claims—amounting, principal and interest, to the sum of $1,586,745 86—making an aggregate of $2,026,139 68.

"It was hoped that the Mexican government could promptly discharge the amount of these claims, according to the terms of the treaty; but we were again destined to disappointment. That government stated its inability to comply with these terms, and its desire that they should be modified. The government of the United States, ever willing to comply with the wishes of the Mexican government, so far as this could be done without compromitting the rights of our citizens, acceded to this request, and on the 30th January, 1843, concluded a new convention with the Mexican government on the very terms which it had proposed. Under its provisions, the interest due on the whole amount awarded was to be paid on the 30th April, 1843; and the principal, with the accruing interest, was made payable in five years, in equal instalments at the end of every three months. Under this new arrangement, made to favor the Mexican Republic, nothing has ever been paid except the interest due on the 30th April, 1843, and three of the twenty instalments.

"But this is not all, of which we have just cause for complaint. There were pending before the umpire, at the time when the commission expired, 78 claims, which had been examined and allowed by the American commissioners, amounting, principal and interest, to the sum of $928,627 88. Upon these he refused to decide, alleging his authority under the convention had expired. In addition to these claims, six other claims, amounting to $3,336,837 05, were presented too late to be considered by the board before its dissolution. To provide for the final adjudication of these two latter classes of claims, as well as others which had not been presented to the board, a third convention was signed at Mexico, on the 20th November, 1843. This convention was ratified by the Senate of the United States on the 30th January, 1844, with two amendments. The first changed the place of meeting of the board of commissioners from Mexico to the city of Washington; and the second struck out the 16th article, which referred the claims of a pecuniary nature that the two governments might have against each other to the board, with an appeal to the umpire in case a majority of the commissioners could not agree.

"These amendments were manifestly reasonable. To have compelled the claimants, all of whom are citizens of the United States, to proceed to Mexico with their documents and testimony, would, in a great degree, have defeated the object of the commission. Besides, a new board was to be, in fact, but a continuance of the old one; and its duties would have been chiefly to complete the business which had been left unfinished in the city of Washington by the former commission.

"In regard to the second amendment, it may be remarked that it never had been suggested, in the course of the negotiation, that either of the governments had claims of a pecuniary character on the other, or that any claims existed except those of American citizens on the republic of Mexico.

"Upon a reference of these two amendments of the Senate to the government of Mexico, it interposed the same evasions, difficulties, and delays, which have ever characterized its policy towards the United States. It has never yet decided whether it would or would not accede to them, although the subject has repeatedly been pressed upon its consideration by our ministers. The convention of 30th April, 1843, has thus become a dead letter.

"It ought also to be stated, that since the final adjournment of the board of commissioners on the 25th February, 1842, twenty-eight new claims have been filed in the Department of State.—Seventeen of these amount, according to the estimate of the claimants, to the sum of $1,147,989 55; and the remaining eleven have [illegible] whole:

The amount finally adjudicated under the convention of the 11th April, 1829, is - - -	$2,026,139 86
The claims referred to the umpire upon a disagreement between the American and Mexican commissioners, but which were not decided by him, - - -	928,627 88
Amount of claims submitted to the board too late to be considered, according to the estimate of the claimants themselves, - -	3,336,637 05
Amount of 17 claims filed in the Department of State since the adjournment of the board, according to the estimate of the claimants themselves, - - - -	1,147,989 55

Together with eleven other claims, filed since that period, on which the claimants have placed no estimate."

The reader will see that we can give only a brief sketch of the discreditable details which the full and authentic accounts on file in the department at Washington unfold. For these atrocities Mexico has no apology to offer, and her reluctance, not to say her refusal to do justice, is plain enough throughout the whole controversy.

On this account of monstrous wrongs we need not offer a comment. Have we not forborne with Mexico until forbearance became culpable? In the name of all that is sacred in national justice and national honor, what would the advocates of Mexico have us to do? Would they have us suffer on, and apologize for Mexico whilst she plunders our merchants, imprisons and murders our citizens, insults and degrades our flag? If, indeed, this will satisfy them, all this we have done. In 1837, all parties agreed the time of forbearance had passed; but eight years more passed away, and only brought constantly recurring and more aggravated injuries, not one of which the United States would have borne from a formidable power. Mexico, whilst she repeated her injuries, at last determined to evade an amicable convention, and persevere in her insults.

We shall notice in brief terms the subject of Texas, which followed close upon this accumulation of wrongs on the part of Mexico. That country had once a federal constitution, and was composed of sovereign States. A tyrant trampled her constitution under his feet, abolished the constitutions of the States, and crushed all resistance, by his mercenaries, until he came to Texas. We all recollect the universal burst of applause from these States when the Texans defeated the tyrant and made him a prisoner. Texas was independent by right as soon as the federal constitution of Mexico was destroyed. It is false to represent her as a revolted province of Mexico. She was a sovereign State, owing no allegiance to the central government of Mexico. The United States had ample reason to declare war with Mexico, and guaranty the independence of Texas; but our government stood aloof, and left Mexico to perpetrate in Texas her deeds of perfidy and savage barbarity unmolested, in the midst of her insults to us. Long after Texas was an independent country, recognized as such by the leading governments of the world, and in fact known to be as independent as Mexico herself, and enjoying the blessings of a free and stable government, whilst Mexico was the constant theatre of revolutions and civil wars—long after this well known condition of things, Texas was annexed to the United States by the unanimous sentiment of her people.—We shall not discuss the right or wrong of the deed. Mexico lost Texas by her own infamy—not by any act of ours. She was ready to acknowledge she had lost it, and surrender a claim which all the world saw was ridiculous, provided the United States would not be benefitted by it. Throughout this whole transaction this country treated Mexico with all courtesy; whilst her conduct to us was that of insolent bravado. She did not formally declare war, as she held that war already existed upon the annexation of Texas. Her minister demanded his passports and returned home. Her consuls left our ports, and all amicable relations were suspended by the acts of Mexico.

This unpropitious condition of things the present administration inherited from its predecessors. Anxious above all things for peace—the true policy of this country—if possible to be secured on any honorable terms, and determined to place our country in the right, even to the last, the President, at the hazard of inviting additional insult, made another effort to ascertain if Mexico would receive a commissioner to settle amicably all disputes between the two countries. Mexico was understood to accede to this proposal explicitly. A minister was promptly sent; and at the request of Mexico our fleet was withdrawn from her coast, that she might not seem to act under constraint. Paredes, a monarchist in sentiment, taking advantage of the phrenzy for war with the United States, denounced Herrera, the then President of Mexico, for the attempt to treat with the United States; charged him with "thwarting the wish of the army to march against Texas." On this war hobby he rode over Herrera and placed himself in power. This new President and his dominant party breathed nothing but the most implacable hostility to the United States. Our minister was dismissed upon the ground that Mexico had only agreed to receive a commissioner to settle the dispute about Texas, and not a minister, as Mr. Slidell was. The military power of the country began to be organized. It was proclaimed that Mexico had no recourse but that of war; that to arms she must appeal. At this point the North American, a whig paper of Philadelphia, thus summed up the condition of our relations with Mexico. It may be found in the North American of April 24th, 1846:

"* * * The [illegible] is suffic[illegible] Our [illegible] manding [illegible] insults we [illegible] we have rec[illegible] eary to arouse our [illegible]

"* * * What will our [illegible] The wrong has reached the uttermost. All that Mexico is capable of doing against us she has done. Her proclamations are declarations of war. She does not invade our territory, or meet us upon the sea, only because she cannot—and she says so. Every effort to insult, degrade, and wrong us, she has exhausted. It will not be denied that such a policy demands action of some sort from our government. It cannot be amicable, for she has dismissed our minister, and rejects, as an abomination, the proffer even of a plea for negotiation."

"* * * If we were at open war with the most powerful European government, such proffers would not have been so received. It is an insult so deliberate, a wrong so profound, that to endure it, is to invite, from the meanest of the communities of the earth, indignity and oppression. It will be admitted that there is no propriety in leaving such an issue open and neglected. The honor of nations, like that of individuals, brooks no delay."

"* * * Our duty is plain; we should either retrace our steps, or go on. To stand still and permit Mexico to treat us and our citizens as robbers of her territory, and therefore as unworthy of recognition under the laws of nations, is a degradation that cannot be endured. 'If we must have war, Mexico is our field,' not for conquest, for her confines have not an acre that we covet, not a being that we could accept as a fellow-citizen, *but to redeem our country from a boldness and baseness of vituperation and insult, for which the diplomacy of the century has no parallel.*"

"* * * If our administration waits for the intervention of a revolution, its delay is unwise. We have seen one government succeeding another in Mexico; but no change in the policy towards the United States. If hopes be entertained from the cock-fighting braggart in Havana, it is only necessary to revert to the facts of his capture and release in Texas, to exhibit the idleness of such hopes. No trust can be placed in a wretch so debased, treacherous, cowardly and cruel as Santa Anna. He it was that dashed the hopes of the Mexican Republic, by protracting their federal constitution.

"Of the States to whom that constitution was guaranteed, Texas alone stood fast to her allegiance. She did not revolutionize, but opposed revolution; and in that fact is she now vindicated for what followed. His attempt to enslave her was foiled; he became a captive, was freed under a pledge of friendship, and repaid an unheard of act of generosity with the bitterest hostility. Should this violator of treaties, this hero of cock-fights, regain power, our government can win nothing from him that it does not pay for. There is, therefore, in the prospect of revolution, nothing to justify delay upon the part of our government."

"* * * War is a great evil; but there are greater evils. The issue between this country and Mexico has reached a point where there is no room for turning. Our government should act with promptness and decision, and upon a scale worthy of the republic."

We may observe that the editor of this paper is now amongst the most violent in behalf of Mexico—denouncing the war and the President; but this article was written when the prompt and decided course of the administration was not foreseen, and when the writer expressed the plain truth which the facts warranted—when he had no party interests to subserve. And it will be seen from the brief statement of facts which we have made, that the North American did not state the case too strongly.

To show still further the impartial opinion of intelligent men of all parties at that time, read the following from the New Orleans Bee, a leading whig paper of Louisiana. It will be seen that it was written just after the Mexican forces had crossed the Rio Grande:

"Mexico has by a long series of unprovoked aggressions, brought upon herself the calamity of war—always dire but doubtful, perilous and fatal when waged by a superior against an inferior power. Our forbearances ill-timed and too long main-

71.2009.085.20446